

2-4-9-29  
20021084

# State Ethics Commission

ANNUAL REPORT 2000



RECEIVED

JUL 26 2001

MARYLAND STATE ARCHIVES





**COMMISSION MEMBERS:**  
CHARLES O. MONK, II, *Chairman*  
• DOROTHY R. FAIT  
MICHAEL L. MAY  
D. BRUCE POOLE  
APRIL E. SEPULVEDA

## STATE ETHICS COMMISSION

9 STATE CIRCLE, SUITE-200  
ANNAPOLIS, MARYLAND 21401  
410-974-2068  
Toll Free 1-877-669-6085

JOHN E. O'DONNELL  
*Executive Director*  
ROBERT A. HAHN  
*General Counsel*  
JENNIFER K. ALLGAIR  
*Staff Counsel*

# MARYLAND STATE ETHICS COMMISSION

## TWENTY-SECOND ANNUAL REPORT

January 1, 2000 - December 31, 2000



# STATE ETHICS COMMISSION

January 1, 2000 - December 31, 2000

## Twenty-Second Annual Report

### GENERAL STATUTORY IMPLEMENTATION

The State Ethics Commission met 10 times during Calendar Year 2000 and was involved in program activity relating to all areas of its statutory mandate. These general activities covered financial disclosure, conflict of interest, lobbyist disclosure and conduct restrictions, local government ethics laws, school board ethics regulations, advisory opinions, enforcement matters, employee education, and public information activities.

A Commission and staff activity involved implementing new legislation which required a new lobbyist disclosure form and informational materials. The Commission was also involved in making legislative recommendations to legislative committees and the Executive Branch. One member of the Commission and the Commission staff were extensively involved in a comprehensive study of the Maryland Lobbying Law initiated by the General Assembly in 1999 and completed in late 2000.

One concern which impacted on staff operations during 2000 was a legislative mandate for the Commission office to move to Annapolis. This caused staff turnover and other operational disruptions which impacted on the operation of the financial disclosure program and other activities. Although the Commission was advised by the State that no space was available and it established a part-time Annapolis branch office in the year 2000, this issue was not resolved thus causing further turnover. The plan at the end of 2000 was to relocate the Commission offices to Annapolis in the second quarter of 2001.

An increasing workload for the Commission is reviewing additions and deletions of employees required to file financial disclosure. Another area of increased work load is evaluating the large number of new State boards created each year by the General Assembly determining if they are covered by the Ethics Law and whether the board will be required to file financial disclosure statements.

#### Issuance of Advisory Opinions

The Commission issues advisory opinions in response to requests from officials, employees, lobbyists, and others who are subject to the Ethics Law. Additionally, the Commission may issue advisory opinions to other persons at its discretion. During Calendar Year 2000, the Commission issued 7 formal published opinions. The formal opinions considered in 2000 primarily dealt with the employment prohibitions of the Ethics Law. Other issues considered involved procurement, participation, prestige and secondary affiliations with local government as an appointed or elected official. A major factor reducing the need for formal opinions issued by the Commission is the large number of existing

opinions that can now be used for fast informal guidance by the Commission or staff thus expediting advice. The Commission staff was able to provide informal guidance in 1307 potential formal request situations based on existing opinions of the Commission. The Commission itself provided informal advice in lieu of formal opinion guidance, usually in the form of a letter, in 125 situations during the year. Informal guidance covered nearly all aspects of the Ethics Law. Many advice inquiries were in part caused by State employee salary support limitations in some agencies of State government which have resulted in a substantial number of secondary employment questions. The combined total number of advice situations (formal, Commission informal, and staff informal) stayed about the same during 2000. This follows substantial increases in the late 1980s and early 1990s. The total for 2000 was 1432 compared to 411 in 1986. The Commission began keeping statistics on this combined activity in 1986. Hopefully some of this reflects a greater understanding of the law's requirements by employees and officials in part due to new training programs.

Another part of the advice process is to consider various exemption programs enacted as part of the Ethics Law. The Commission approved some board and commission member financial disclosure exemptions and reviewed and commented on sponsored research exemption reports and procedures administered by colleges and universities.

Advisory opinions are now available on the Internet by using the website of the Secretary of State, Division of State Documents, which can also be accessed directly from the State Ethics Commission's website.

### Financial Disclosure

The administration of the financial disclosure program continued to involve the identification of those required to file, providing technical assistance to filers, and monitoring compliance with the Law. The Commission was involved in reviewing a large number of requests by various agencies to add or delete positions from the financial disclosure filing list. Action on these requests, which is part of the agenda at nearly all Commission meetings, has increased the list of filers. The Commission also reviewed the Ethics Law status of new boards and commissions and considered and acted upon requests by advisory boards to be exempted from the requirement to file financial disclosure statements. This activity has significantly increased in recent years due to a substantial increase in the number of boards and commissions being created by the General Assembly. Compliance review of forms is conducted as part of a phased program for review of the forms of officials and employees. Currently there are over 8,000 persons filing financial disclosure forms and this number continues to grow. Boards and Commissions are currently required to file a limited form of financial disclosure. In addition, copies of all judicial official financial disclosure forms are also filed at the Commission office. As part of the review program, letters are sent to some filers regarding the need to provide further information in order to meet filing requirements. Conflict of interest monitoring is also part of this process. The Commission was unable to strengthen its financial disclosure review program in 2000 due to staff turnover in the position having primary responsibility for financial disclosure activities.

In addition to the regular financial disclosure program, a very substantial number of appointees to executive boards or commissions seeking limited conflict of interest exemptions from the appointing authority, must file a form publicly disclosing areas of existing conflicts with the Commission, the appointing authority and the Senate where applicable. The Commission staff coordinated the filing of these forms with the appointing authority, reviewed the forms and assisted a large number of appointees throughout the year to complete these disclosures.

A new financial disclosure program is the filing of preliminary financial disclosure forms in January in some situations by legislators. The first year filing started in January of 2000. Early experience suggests that some legislators, having significant changes in their situation thus requiring filing, are not recognizing the need to file preliminary forms.

### Lobbyist Disclosure and Regulation

During the lobbying year which ended on October 31, 2000, 2,082 lobbying registrations were filed with the Commission. This represents an increase from the 2,008 registrations filed in 1999. The 2,082 registrations were filed by 609 different lobbyists on behalf of 924 separate employers. (Some employers have more than one lobbyist and many lobbyists have more than one employer.) This compares to 864 employers having one or more registrants in the previous year and 602 individual lobbyists in the prior year. The program has grown very substantially since 1979, the year when the program was taken over from the Secretary of State. The totals for registrations is the highest in the history of the program. The growth in the number of lobbyists has been slower than the growth in registrations, employers and expenditures. For example, in 1988 there were 415 registered lobbyists, 545 employers and 744 registrations spending \$9,405,759. This data reflects a trend of a growing lobbying business being concentrated within a smaller group of lobbyist and firms. Although the largest number of lobbyists are registered during the legislative session, registrations are beginning and ending throughout the lobbying year, which begins on November 1 and ends on October 31 of the following year. Most persons registered to lobby have a single registration representing one employer, however, 111 lobbyists had two or more registrations during this time period, 72 registrants had four or more employers, and 46 lobbyists had eight or more employers. The Ethics Commission monitors lobbyist registration and reporting and other parts of the lobbying law covering gifts, contingent fees, and campaign finance activity.

The \$22,594,270 in lobbying expenditures reported for the period of October 31, 2000, represents a decrease of \$871,113 over the previous year. This is the first decrease since records began to be fully kept in 1979. Although there was an overall decrease in expenditures, this is essentially the result of some special circumstances in the previous year resulting in much larger expenditures for grassroots lobbying and professional research assistance. A further decrease in individual meals reflected law changes as did a slight increase in special events. Lobbyist compensation continued to increase. Lobbying expenditures have very significantly increased since the Commission compiled \$2,864,454 of expenditures in 1979, the first year the Ethics Commission administered the filing program. Expenditures for gifts and entertainment in 2000 decreased from \$757,356 to \$739,466. The total for gifts and entertainment was substantially below the record level of \$824,685 reported in 1993 reflecting law changes since that time but is far above the \$213,385 reported in 1980. The amount for food and beverages other than special categories decreased from \$28,596 to \$4,067. The amount in this category was dramatically lower than the \$416,924 reported in this category for 1992. This decrease reflects stronger disclosure laws in recent years and an increasing reluctance of officials to accept this type of entertainment. However, substantial use was made of the new ability to entertain at legislative organization meetings resulting in \$25,543 in expenses. The amount spent for special events did increase from \$504,818 in 1998 to \$688,176 in 2000. This is substantially above the \$245,288 reported for these types of events in 1994. Under current law, special events include events to which all members of the General Assembly, either house, a standing committee, or geographic delegation is invited. The expansion of no recipient disclosure to geographic committees and the very small size of some of these groupings is likely to maintain or increase the volume of this type of entertainment. There were 100 all members of the General Assembly events reported in 2000 totaling \$497,612.

This is slightly lower than the amount spent for the previous year even though the number of events substantially increased by 46. Not all of these funds were spent on General Assembly members because the cost for attendance of event sponsors, lobbyists, and others is sometimes reported in the event total cost. There were 63 events reported for House of Delegates Standing Committees and 44 for Senate Standing Committees. The total of 107 committee events was higher than the 105 events in 1999. The most entertained committee in the House of Delegates was the Economic Matters Committee with 22 events. The least entertained Standing Committees in the House were the Appropriations and Judiciary Committees with 4 events. In the Senate, the least entertained committee was the Economic and Environmental Matters Committee with 6 events. The most events reported in the Senate were for the Finance Committee with 20 events. The regional delegation with the most events reported was the Prince George's County Delegation with 17 events.

A detailed analysis of special events spending is contained in Appendix C of this report. Lobbyists are also required to file gift reports naming individuals receiving meals, tickets or other gifts above certain thresholds. Fourteen lobbyists filed 19 gift reports in 2000 compared to 102 in 1999. Gift reports may name one or more gift recipients. Gift reports tend to be concentrated among the higher spending employers. There were 9 special gift reports filed on behalf of the top 120 employers ranked by total lobbyist expenditures. The next 120 in that ranking only filed 3 special gift reports. New gift limitations effective October 1, 1999, and the fact that gift reports are no longer required in some situations has resulted in the very substantial decline in gift reports.

An analysis of individual reports indicates that 115 lobbyist employers reported having total lobbying expenditures of \$50,000 or more. There were 292 lobbyist employers reporting total expenditures of \$25,000 or more. This compares to 273 employers reaching this total in 1999. Reports of individual lobbyists registered on behalf of one or more employers indicate that 82 reported \$50,000 or more in compensation for services. Forty-three lobbyists reported compensation of \$100,000 or more. There has been a trend over a long period of time for fee lobbying to often be organized on a firm basis rather than a solo practitioner basis. This ranges from a group within large law firms to government relations groups unassociated with the practice of law. In 2000, each of the top three fee earning firms earned over \$1,000,000. This information is outlined in Appendix D.

Examples of topic areas involving large total employer expenditures during the reporting period included business, utilities, racing, labor, health, banking, energy, communications, technology, attorneys, real estate, construction and insurance. Employer lobbying spending continues to increase. In 1988, only 5 employers spent over \$100,000 on lobbying. In 1999, 35 employers exceeded \$100,000. A list of those employers expending \$25,000 or more and those lobbyists reporting \$50,000 or more in compensation is included in Appendices A and B of this report.

The following expenditure data summarizes lobbying expenditures for the last three lobbying years:

	<u>10/31/98</u>	<u>10/31/99</u>	<u>10/31/00</u>
1. Expenditures for meals and beverages for officials or employees or their immediate families.	\$ 57,358	\$ 28,596	\$ 4,067



2. Expenditures for special events, including parties, dinners, athletic events, entertainment, and other functions to which all members of the General Assembly, either house thereof, or any standing committee thereof were invited. (Date, location, group benefitted, and total expense for each event are also reported.)	\$ 504,819	\$ 684,958	\$ 688,176
3. Expenses for food, lodging, and scheduled entertainment of officials and employees and spouses for a meeting given in return for participation in a panel or speaking engagement at the meeting.	\$ 80,129	\$ 3,704	\$ 8,356
4. Expenditures for food and beverages at approved legislative organizational meetings.	N/A	N/A	\$ 25,543
5. Expenses for a ticket or free admission to attend charitable, cultural or political events where all members of a legislative unit are invited.	N/A	N/A	\$ 3,122
6. Gifts to or for officials or employees or their immediate families (not included in B-1 through B-5).	\$ 14,886	\$ 40,098	\$ 10,202
<b><u>Subtotal of items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6</u></b>	<b><u>\$657,192</u></b>	<b><u>\$757,356</u></b>	<b><u>\$739,466</u></b>
7. Total compensation paid to registrant (not including sums reported in any other section).	\$17,237,276	\$18,320,596	\$18,947,901
8. Salaries, compensation and reimbursed expenses for staff of the registrant.	\$ 783,605	\$ 766,802	\$ 721,006
9. Office expenses not reported in items 5 and 6.	\$ 830,386	\$ 937,386	\$ 772,104
10. Cost of professional and technical research and assistance not reported in items 5 and 6.	\$ 729,941	\$ 597,500	\$ 229,265

11. Cost of publications which expressly encourage persons to communicate with officials or employees.	\$2,160,301	\$1,499,450	\$ 598,429
12. Fees and expenses paid to witnesses.	\$ 29,540	\$ 29,265	\$ 57,123
13. Other expenses.	\$ 442,347	\$ 557,028	\$ 528,976
<b><u>Total of items 1 through 11</u></b>	<b><u>\$22,870,588</u></b>	<b><u>\$23,465,383</u></b>	<b><u>\$22,594,270</u></b>

*N/A Categories Were Not Required To Be Reported in Earlier Years*

{NOTE: At the time the Annual Report was compiled, some lobbyist expenditure information was subject to adjustment based on the staff review program.}

#### Enforcement Activities

The Ethics Law and implementing rules of the Commission provide that any person may file a complaint with the Commission. Complaints filed with the Commission must be signed, under oath, and allege a violation of the Law by a person subject to the Law. Additionally, the Commission may file a complaint on its own initiative, and it carries out preliminary inquiries of potential law violations at its discretion. Because of the limited investigative resources available to the Commission, there is some backlog of enforcement matters pending with the Commission.

In Calendar Year 2000, the Commission issued or accepted 12 complaints. Four complaints involved financial disclosure matters, 8 complaints involved lobbyist matters and conflict of interest issues. The number of complaints was lower this year primarily due to staff turnover and disruptions caused by a pending move to Annapolis. This delayed enforcement of the financial disclosure filing compliance program. During this calendar year action was completed on 57 complaints. Fifty-two of the completed complaint matters were financial disclosure matters. Failure to timely file financial disclosure statement complaints were terminated by accepted the late filing as a cure. Fifteen late financial disclosure complaints were resolved by submission of the form and acceptance of a stipulation of settlement which included an admission of late filing violation, waiver of confidentiality, acceptance of a reprimand, and the payment of funds (in lieu of late fees and fines) to the State. A total of \$7,061 was paid to the State pursuant to settlement agreements during 2000.

Three hearings were held during the year involving respondents who had failed to timely file the required financial disclosure statement. The Respondents appeared at two of the hearings. The hearings resulted in a finding of failure to timely file; assessed late fees in accord with Section 15-405(d)(2) of the Ethics Law; and a reprimand. Two of the complaint hearings involved current State employees. In the case of one of the current employees who appeared at a hearing, the Commission also recommended to the Respondent's appointing authority her suspension without pay for two weeks. This recommendation was made in part because of the Respondent's previous complaint history and failure to file several annual statements. The Respondent was assessed a total of \$1,250 in late fees.

Three of the complaints completed during the year involved lobbyist matters. One complaint involved a fee lobbyist who had failed to timely register on behalf of an employer. A hearing was held in 1999 on the complaint with the Respondent present and resulted in a finding that the lobbyist violated Section 15-701(a) of the Ethics Law. The Commission ordered him to pay a late filing fee of \$250. The Respondent appealed the Commission's order to the Circuit Court. In 2000, the Circuit Court affirmed the Commission's Final Report and Order and the Respondent paid the late fees. A second complaint was closed because of the death of the Respondent. The third complaint was dismissed after the Respondent was subject to criminal sanctions and professional discipline.

The Commission also considered several other situations involving lobbyists who had failed to timely file either a registration or lobbying activity report. These matters resulted in agreements with lobbyists paying amounts up to \$250 per report. The Commission received a total of \$7,000 payments to the State of Maryland from 18 different lobbyists. All enforcement payments are deposited in the State's general fund and cannot be used by the Commission.

Two conflict of interest complaints were resolved during Calendar Year 2000. The first complaint involved the application of Section 15-508, the procurement provisions, to a vendors activities in a particular procurement. The Commission determined that certain cure actions taken by the Respondents were consistent with the purposes of the Ethics Law and the matter was closed. The second complaint was resolved by settlement agreement where the Respondent admitted that his establishment of a business to contract with this own agency, even though it was discussed to the agency and approved by it, violated the Ethics Law. The Respondent also made certain reimbursements to the agency, paid \$500 in lieu of civil fines to the Commission, and was reprimanded.

At the end of Calendar Year 2000, 2 complaints were pending involving conflict of interest. Additionally, there were 24 complaints involving financial disclosure and lobbyist filings pending. The total enforcement payments and late fees actually received by the Commission in 2000 was \$14,561. Finally, there remains a conflict of interest complaint from 1997 which had been appealed by the respondent to the Circuit Court and is now pending before the Court of Appeals. The Commission's order in that case included payment of \$1,000 in late fees and civil fines in the amount of \$7,500. The Commission is represented in court on this matter by the Office of the Attorney General. Depending on the ruling of the Court of Appeals there may be a need to seek amendments in the Ethics Law.

#### Local Government Ethics Laws

Maryland counties and cities are required under the Ethics Law to enact local laws similar to the State Law. In addition to the requirement that counties and cities enact ethics laws, in 1983, the General Assembly amended the Law to require local school boards either to promulgate ethics regulations similar to the State Law or be covered by county ethics laws. Most of the staff activity relating to local ethics programs during 2000 involved providing limited technical assistance to local ethics officials regarding ongoing administration of local government ethics programs. As part of its responsibilities, the Commission reviewed new or revised ethics laws for 7 localities during 2000. The Commission was also engaged in review of the Ethics Law status of employees of States Attorney's Offices and Sheriff's Offices. Criteria for evaluating similarity to the State Law are defined in Commission regulations. Municipalities, based on size and other factors, may be exempted from all or part of the requirement, though an exemption may be granted only in response to a written request. The Commission has held several Statewide local government ethics seminars since

1979. A statewide seminar was held in the Fall of 2000 where 152 people representing 61 ethics agencies attended a full day program discussing all phases of the Ethics Law and administration. The Commission also received and reviewed reports from Prince George's County and Montgomery County regarding special land use ethics reports required in those jurisdictions.

An annual listing of local governments having ethics laws is to be published in the *Maryland Register* and included with the Commission regulations in COMAR 19A.04 and 19A.05.

### Educational and Informational Activities

The Commission staff has been active in providing information to those covered by the Ethics Law, as well as other persons interested in its requirements. A substantial daily staff workload has involved advising employees, officials, candidates and lobbyists on how to complete forms, and providing informal advice regarding possible conflicts of interest. The Commission staff has assisted local government and school board officials in drafting their ethics laws and regulations. The staff has also provided technical advice to local government ethics boards. Presentations were made by the staff to various groups covered by the Law or interested in the operation of the Law. Numerous formal briefings and training programs were made to groups of employees, officials, or lobbyists on the requirements of the Law. Employees of several agencies or departments received special briefings. New legislation passed in 1999 requires new financial disclosure filers to receive 2 hours of Ethics Law training. The Commission developed plans in late 1999 to implement this mandate. The annual lobbyist briefing was provided in Annapolis. Presentations were also made to other groups interested in the operation of the lobbying law. Part of this activity included presentations to students and international visitors. In order to meet the mandate for mandatory officials training, seminars are being held in the Commission's offices each month. Additional 2 hour training sessions are being provided at agency locations by the State Ethics Commission staff.

Part of the Commission's public information activity involves distribution of lists of registered lobbyists and provision of assistance to persons inspecting various forms filed with the Commission. Pamphlets describing the Ethics Law have been made available to management level employees in State agencies. Another pamphlet covering ethics requirements for part-time members of State boards and commissions is also being distributed on a limited basis. Fiscal limitations have essentially reduced the ability to develop new formerly printed materials. The Commission's staff does distribute, through interagency mail, a special two-page summary of ethics requirements to State agency managers. Special memos regarding the impact of the ethics law on gifts, procurement, post-employment, employment, and on political activity are also distributed. Also, memos on lobbying laws relating to private colleges, lobbyist political activity, and a memo regarding adjustments to the procurement ethics provisions were distributed. A special memo to advise potential new members of boards and commissions of the impact of the Ethics Law has also been developed.

A home page on the Internet was maintained. The home page includes a program summary, a lobbyist list and related data, the Annual Report, special explanatory memos, and a bi-monthly bulletin. Also included are copies of lobbying and financial disclosure forms and the ability to access these forms. A new feature of this site, established in 1999, is the provision of a list of State vendors that can be queried by agency or vendor. Another new feature is an ethics question of the month which answers hypothetical questions based on past Commission opinions. The Internet provides a cost effective mechanism for providing

ethics information and training to those covered by the Ethics Law and public access to ethics information. In 2001, it is planned to add a new component featuring the activities of local ethics agencies. The volume of persons using this website has been steadily growing. The staff is also very frequently involved in assisting the public and press in inspecting public records of lobbyists and officials and providing access to other ethics law information in media appearances or other means.

## **LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS**

In 2000, the General Assembly passed two State Ethics Law bills. House Bill 974 establishes for the first time a business transactions disclosure law covering transactions between individual regulated lobbyists and certain officials. The other passing legislation (House Bill 702 / Senate Bill 541) strengthened the vendor/procurement ethics provisions of the Ethics Law by making sure people involved in vendor selection are not affiliated with a proposed vendor.

The General Assembly failed to pass House Bill 100, an State Ethics Commission proposal to make sure all Chief local Election Administrators file financial disclosure. The bill easily passed the House of Delegates but failed in the Senate Economic and Environmental Affairs Committee.

The Commission continues to review the adequacy of the Public Ethics Law as required by the statute. The Commission has also reviewed the report by the Commission on Lobbyist Ethics and has no objection to its recommendations as several of the Commission's proposals are consistent with State Ethics Commission recommendations. The recommendation listed below was specifically suggested for departmental legislation in 2000. (This bill has been introduced as departmental legislation.)

### **Ethics Jurisdiction - Employees of State's Attorney's and Sheriff's Offices**

The Ethics Law clearly places the elected State's Attorneys and Sheriffs under the jurisdiction of the State Ethics Law. Historically, the other employees of these offices have been considered to be covered by local ethics laws. Recent court cases have created uncertainty about the validity of this arrangement in the absence of a specific statutory provision. The State Ethics Commission believes the nature of the funding and activities of these employees would on balance be better controlled by County Ethics Law. The Commission therefore has submitted legislation to resolve the current uncertainty by making these persons subject to local ethics law in a specific statutory provision.

## **ADDITIONAL LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS**

- The Law should be formally amended to more specifically reflect advice by the Commission and the Attorney General regarding testimonial fund raising by employees and officials, which is fully covered by the Ethics and Elections Law.

- The Election Law provisions dealing with contested elections do not clearly deal with these matters leaving potential questions about the solicitation, acceptance, and disclosure of these funds. Election Law should be amended to clearly establish limits and disclosure of this activity as part of the election function and not as gift activity regulated by the Ethics Law.

- The Ethics Law should specifically mandate the Chief Election Administrator in each county to file financial disclosure and not depend on the salary that may be set for the position to govern filing requirements.

- There is a need to consider granting the Commission at least minimal fining authority in ethics and lobbyist matters in order to provide a formal alternative to expensive court proceedings.

- The current Law does not seem to always clearly deal with gifts from foreign governments. There is a need to review the issue and clarify the Law.

- The post-employment provisions of the Ethics Law should be reviewed and revised in order to avoid abuses that can occur under the technical language of the current law. This review should focus on higher level management positions.

- The Ethics Law prohibits certain types of representation before State agencies. However, except for special legislator disclosure, there is no specific required disclosure of representation before State agencies. It is recommended that officials who appear before State agencies for compensation include on their annual disclosure form at a minimum the identity of any agencies involved in this compensated representation.

- The Commission has been presented with several situations where high State officials have been invited to serve on the board of directors of private corporations having sensitive business or regulatory involvement with the State. The existing Ethics Law provisions are not well designed to effectively control all of the conflicts that can be caused by such affiliations. It is recommended that membership by high officials on the boards of these types of corporations be controlled more specifically in the Ethics Law.

- Issues regarding the spouses of employees or officials have arisen in Maryland and on a national basis. The Maryland Public Ethics Law does not consistently and clearly address these issues or provide sufficient policy guidance in these matters. Spouse ethics issues have become more prevalent in part as a reflection of both spouses having careers and other economic relationships. For example, the Law does not always clearly deal with gift disclosure situations that may occur in these situations.

- The Commission receives many questions from agencies and others concerning issues involving State related foundations. Some of these questions relate clearly to the Ethics Law and can be resolved by the Commission. Many of these questions involve fiscal and general policy issues unrelated or only indirectly related to the Ethics Law. It is not possible for the Commission to determine appropriate policy in these areas. Any control mechanisms that need to be established to reach these other concerns should be established by the Executive and Legislative branches of government as part of ongoing policy development.

- Consideration should be given to having new officials file a financial disclosure statement covering their holdings as of the time when they come into their position rather than for the previous calendar year.

- In the 1999 Session of the General Assembly, the Harford County Liquor Board and its employees were placed under the authority of the State Ethics Commission. However, the employees of the Board, regardless of salary or duties, were excluded from financial disclosure requirements. This exclusion is unprecedented in any other agency or board and should be changed to make the disclosure requirements for these employees the same as other employees subject to the State Ethics Law.

- The need for disclosure of interests in mutual funds should be reviewed to determine if all of this information is fully necessary to accomplish the purposes of the Law.

- The provisions of §15-608 regarding attributable interests should be studied with the idea of reducing the burden caused by the disclosure requirements when a person has a small share in a large diverse testamentary trust.

- Judicial candidates should be required to file financial disclosure in each year of their candidacy in the same way as other candidates for State office.

- In election years improperly filed candidate's disclosure forms create unique enforcement problems. Before a violation can be found and made public a variety of confidential administrative and adjudicatory processes have to occur. In most cases this process would extend well beyond the primary election and probably beyond the general election. This means that serious completion problems or even false disclosure could exist unknown to the voting public. A very large percentage of non-incumbent candidates have substantial financial disclosure statement completion problems. A review should be made by the Executive and the General Assembly to determine whether confidentiality should be eliminated for candidate's financial disclosure enforcement cases at an earlier point in the enforcement process.

- Some consideration should be given to removing the current language dealing with Commission review of forms in §15-205(a)(5), and substituting a provision for review consistent with standards to be established by the Commission.

- In order to avoid uncertain and confusing application and administration of the Law, the special provisions of §15-807 making members of State boards funded in whole or in part by Baltimore County subject to the county disclosure law instead of the State Law should be considered for elimination, or at a minimum copies of these forms should be filed with the State Ethics Commission.

- The bi-county agency ethics regulations requirements as to employees of these agencies should be reviewed to make sure that sufficient penalty provisions are provided and that the current ethics regulations of the agencies meet the intent of the Law.

- The Commission has informally determined that the bi-county agencies are to be treated as State or local agencies for the purposes of exemptions under the State lobbying registration requirements. The Law should be amended to specifically clarify their status under these provisions.

- Consideration should be given to specifically prohibiting the solicitation of loans or assistance in getting loans by employees and officials from lobbyists and certain regulatees.

- The lobbyist restrictions regarding campaign finance activity should be made more specific as to the impact of these provisions on political party central committee membership by lobbyists.

- Consideration should be given to further limiting the role of lobbyists in political fundraising, particularly in the area of sending fundraising tickets to lobbyists and these tickets being forwarded to their employers.

- The statute of limitations in criminal violations of the State lobbying law is too short and should be extended.

- Consideration should be given to a one-legislative session, no lobbying cooling-off period for former legislative and other employees having significant duties relating to legislation.

- There is a need to include provisions to require lobbying registration and reporting for not-in-the-physical-presence lobbying particularly where significant compensation is involved. This problem will become more significant as new methods of electronic communications are further developed.

- The lobbyist disclosure of gift process could be clarified and strengthened. The rules on immediate public availability of gift reports are inconsistent and the size of some designated regional delegations is too small to avoid reporting avoidance techniques by lobbyists.

- The law should provide that counties or cities may use lobbying registration and reporting with the State Ethics Commission as an alternative or substitute for local filing.

- The provisions for confidentiality in the Ethics Law should be reviewed to determine if they adequately protect privacy without denying needed information to operations agencies or the public.

- The provisions covering school board ethics regulations need to be strengthened to assure that there are adequate sanctions for violations by board members, candidates for board membership and lobbyists.

- There has been an increase in issues regarding potential conflicts of interests involving persons appointed to State boards and commissions. In part, it has been caused by minor short term advisory boards being more frequently created by statute in recent years instead of being created by Executive Order not having the force of law or legislative resolution. Boards created by law are covered by the Ethics Law. A related problem is many new boards are being created with appointments criteria mandating a significant conflict of interest. It is recommended that where minor short-term advisory boards are created, they not be established by law and where statutory boards are created more care be exercised in avoiding mandatory major conflicts of interests in appointment requirements. Lobbyists should not be appointed to boards that have duties relating to their lobbying activities. These types of appointments make violations of the law while on the board or post service almost unavoidable.

- The Commission has noted that consultants have been hired sometimes for a contingent fee to assist business entities to get grants, loans and other financial benefits from the State. In the absence of gift activity, these consultants often fall outside the lobbyist registration requirements. The State now requires lobbyist registration and contingent fee bar where such consultants attempt to influence procurement of \$100,000 or more. The Commission recommends that where these types of consultants attempt to influence substantial State incentives to business entities lobbying registration be required and contingent fees be barred.

- The law prohibiting misuse of confidential information should be extended to cover former officials and employees as to confidential information acquired during their State service.



# APPENDIX A

## EMPLOYER SPENDING \$25,000 OR MORE - ALL REGISTRANTS ALL TYPES OF EXPENSES

*November 1, 1999 - October 31, 2000*

<u>TOTAL AMOUNT</u>	<u>EMPLOYER</u>
1. \$ 298,061.67	A T & T
2. 280,319.60	Cable Telecommunications of MD, DE, & DC
3. 228,655.62	Verizon
4. 221,681.00	Maryland Chamber of Commerce
5. 210,776.79	Maryland State Teachers Association
6. 202,322.17	Maryland Retail Merchants Association
7. 200,788.13	MEDCHI, The Maryland State Medical Society
8. 196,082.36	Maryland Jockey Club/Pimlico Race Track
9. 192,430.67	Maryland Association of Realtors, Inc.
10. 192,032.35	Laurel Racing Association, Inc.
11. 185,909.80	Maryland Hospital Association
12. 176,456.93	Maryland Bankers Association, Inc.
13. 166,566.77	Citizens Against Open Bay Dumping
14. 161,848.39	Atlantic Richfield Company (ARCO)
15. 161,435.77	CareFirst Blue Cross & Blue Shield of Maryland
16. 152,338.98	Association of Maryland Pilots
17. 148,356.45	Allegheny Energy
18. 144,667.50	Greenbelt Metropark, L.L.C.
19. 143,004.00	Maryland State Bar Association
20. 140,596.25	Washington Area New Automobile Dealers Assn.(WANADA)
21. 140,000.00	League of Life and Health Insurers of Maryland
22. 137,768.76	Medstar Health
23. 128,813.00	Marylander's for Efficient and Safe Highways
24. 126,179.58	Maryland Trial Lawyers Association
25. 123,829.85	Potomac Electric Power Company
26. 123,701.90	ESP, Inc.
27. 120,185.97	Baltimore Building & Construction Trades Council/AFL-CIO
28. 117,322.10	Dupont, Inc.
29. 114,458.00	Maryland Association of Health Plans
30. 114,395.54	Adventist Health Care
31. 110,665.64	Washington/Baltimore Cellular Limited Partnership
32. 108,489.20	Automated Wagering, Inc.

33.	107,219.40	Health Facilities Association of Maryland
34.	102,851.21	VA, MD & DE Assn. Of Electric Cooperatives & Choptank Electric Cooperative
35.	99,565.50	Maryland Classified Employees Association
36.	97,826.87	WorldCom, Inc.
37.	95,865.77	Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative, Inc.
38.	95,337.09	Allegany Racing L.L.C.
39.	94,781.18	Advocates for Children & Youth, Inc.
40.	94,532.72	National Rifle Association Institute for Legislative Action
41.	92,536.30	Baltimore Jewish Council & Maryland Jewish Alliance
42.	90,000.00	Buck Distributing Company
43.	89,054.35	St. Joseph Medical Center
44.	87,505.96	Philip Morris Management Corporation
45.	86,941.56	Medical Mutual Liability Insurance Company
46.	84,278.08	Rite Aid Corporation
47.	83,172.75	Foster America, Inc.
48.	82,741.88	Constellation Energy Group, Inc.
49.	82,506.53	State Farm Insurance Companies (IL)
50.	82,166.91	Maryland Tort Reform Coalition
51.	82,076.88	Associated Builders and Contractors/Chesapeake Chapter
52.	81,432.60	Baltimore Ravens, Inc.
53.	80,754.86	Apartment & Office Bldg. Assn. of Metro Washington
54.	79,843.02	Maryland State & D.C. AFL-CIO
55.	78,422.00	Maryland Highway Contractors Association
56.	78,203.63	Common Cause/Maryland
57.	77,162.00	Chemical Industry Council of Maryland
58.	77,104.81	National Federation of Independent Businesses
59.	76,086.52	American Petroleum Institute
60.	75,930.56	Johns Hopkins Medicine
61.	75,737.33	Norfolk Southern Corporation
62.	75,184.54	Nextel Communications
63.	74,935.00	Washington Gas, Maryland Division
64.	74,750.00	MAMSI (Mid-Atlantic Medical Services, Inc.)
65.	74,539.28	Nationwide Insurance Enterprises
66.	74,480.28	Maryland State Dental Association
67.	74,035.00	Johns Hopkins University
68.	73,333.31	Maryland Optometric Association
69.	72,929.94	Mid-Atlantic Non-Profit Health & Housing Assn.
70.	70,077.04	Magellan Health Services
71.	70,019.99	AAI Corporation
72.	69,731.78	American Cancer Society, MD Division

73.	69,500.00	Alcoa Eastalco Works
74.	69,000.00	Science Applications International Corporation
75.	68,098.31	Cloverleaf Enterprises
76.	66,395.93	Maryland New Car and Truck Dealers Assn.
77.	66,010.87	Alzheimer's Disease & Related Disorders Assn. Inc.
78.	65,682.88	American Heart Association
79.	65,223.06	Schaller Anderson of Maryland, LLC
80.	65,202.58	Enron Energy Sevices, Inc.
81.	64,615.00	Digital Commerce Coalition
82.	64,449.11	American Insurance Association
83.	64,369.42	Maryland Farm Bureau, Inc.
84.	63,552.29	Information Systems & Network Corporation
85.	63,464.14	General Motors Corporation
86.	62,741.36	Suburban Hospital
87.	62,715.53	Variable Annuity Life Insurance Co. (VALIC)
88.	62,196.54	Kraft Foods, Inc.
89.	62,123.84	Accenture
90.	62,000.00	Lockheed IMS Corporation
91.	61,878.55	Moran Towing of Maryland
92.	61,395.29	Sverdrup
93.	60,989.54	U. S. Filter Operating Services
94.	60,000.00	University of Phoenix
95.	59,997.50	Microsoft Corporation
96.	58,512.48	Glaxo Wellcome Inc.
97.	58,299.00	Owens Illinois, Inc.
98.	58,000.00	Anheuser-Busch Companies
99.	57,099.00	Maryland Independent College and University Association
100.	57,066.54	Bally's Maryland, Inc.
101.	57,011.13	Investment Company Institute
102.	56,888.43	Maryland Association of Mortgage Brokers
103.	56,150.00	Maryland State Builders Association
104.	55,998.00	Bank of America
105.	55,823.99	Maryland Society of Anesthesiologists
106.	55,794.00	Maryland Association of Non-Profit Organizations
107.	55,745.00	Discovery Communications, Inc.
108.	55,734.50	Winchester Commercial
109.	55,172.54	US Public Affairs, Inc.
110.	55,000.00	Maryland Association of Mutual Insurance Companies
111.	54,395.25	Lifebridge Health
112.	54,236.82	Pharmaceutical Research & Manufacturers of America

113.	53,170.96	HCR Manor Care
114.	52,372.90	Maryland Insurance Council
115.	51,328.00	CONNECTIV
116.	49,909.41	SCI Mid-Atlantic Region
117.	49,115.05	Bethlehem Steel Corporation
118.	49,100.00	Washington Metropolitan Transit Authority
119.	49,000.00	KOBA Institute
120.	48,097.85	Milestone Communications
121.	48,053.97	National Association of Independent Insurers
122.	47,451.91	Professional Insurance Agents Association of PA, MD & DE
123.	47,355.74	Maryland Association of Chain Drug Stores
124.	47,150.00	R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Company
125.	47,149.21	Maryland Society American Institute of Architects, Inc.
126.	46,520.92	EPIC Pharmacies - Maryland Professional Pharmacies, Inc.
127.	45,652.00	Maryland Catholic Conference
128.	45,620.29	Cloverleaf Standardbred Owners Assn.
129.	45,430.00	HLR Service Corporation
130.	45,384.46	Chimes, The
131.	44,767.71	Children's National Medical Center
132.	44,520.00	Greater Baltimore Medical Center
133.	44,370.00	Fairfax County Water Authority
134.	43,681.63	Ocean City Chamber of Commerce
135.	43,502.00	Recording for the Blind & Dyslexic
136.	43,414.52	Motorola, Inc.
137.	43,070.00	Mental Health Association of Maryland
138.	42,875.13	WMDA Service Station & Automotive Repair Assn.
139.	42,500.00	CIGNA Corporation
140.	42,150.00	Eastern Shore of Maryland Educational Consortium
141.	41,752.00	Maryland Works, Inc.
142.	41,519.00	United Healthcare of the Mid-Atlantic
143.	41,500.92	Johnson Controls, Inc.
144.	41,373.00	MBIA Insurance Corporation
145.	41,270.00	Maryland Association of Boards of Education
146.	41,243.00	AFT Maryland
147.	41,000.00	Smoke Free Maryland
148.	40,992.00	Restaurant Association of Maryland, Inc.
149.	40,981.20	Circuit City Stores, Inc.
150.	40,676.13	GTE Service Corporation (Verizon Communications)
151.	40,542.00	Sunoco. Inc.
152.	40,020.00	Southern Maryland Agricultural Association, Inc.

153.	40,000.00	JKC Holding Company LLC
154.	39,974.00	AFSCME Council 92
155.	39,793.00	Northrup Grumman Corporation
156.	39,734.00	Maryland Association of Community Colleges
157.	39,600.00	Comprehensive Management & Administrative Services
158.	39,445.01	Multi-State Associates on behalf of Community Financial Services Assn. Of America
159.	39,346.48	Law Offices of Peter Angelos
160.	39,163.75	Committee to Save the Trail (COST)
161.	38,849.55	Golden Rule Insurance Company
162.	38,789.18	Household Financial Group, Ltd.
163.	38,637.50	May Department Stores Co., The
164.	38,620.54	Greater Baltimore Committee
165.	38,592.00	FMC Corporation
166.	38,550.00	DuPont Pharmaceuticals
167.	38,500.00	Carsonite International
168.	38,414.00	Eli Lilly & Company
169.	38,396.98	Maryland Industrial Group
170.	37,961.01	American College of Emergency Physicians
171.	37,554.42	Insurance Auto Auctions Corporation
172.	37,212.00	Marine Trades Association of Maryland
173.	37,029.00	Maryland Association of Tobacco & Candy
174.	36,642.04	Lorillard Tobacco Company
175.	36,642.04	Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corporation
176.	36,175.54	Westvaco Corporation
177.	36,084.21	Copeland Associates, Inc.
178.	36,000.00	Solipsys Corporation
179.	36,000.00	Maryland Association of Financial Service Center, Inc.
180.	36,000.00	Evangelical Lutheran Church in America/DEL-MD Synod
181.	35,971.75	Maryland Chiropractic Association
182.	35,750.00	Credit Union Insurance Corporation
183.	35,726.91	Genesis Health Ventures
184.	35,654.00	Maryland State Funeral Directors Association
185.	35,516.62	Maryland Motor Truck Association
186.	35,300.00	Maryland State Licensed Beverage Assn.
187.	35,196.00	All State Check Cashing
188.	35,084.21	Aetna US Healthcare, Inc.
189.	35,000.00	Montgomery County Government
190.	35,000.00	Barr Laboratories, Inc.
191.	34,604.60	O'Brien Kreitzberg
192.	34,350.00	Fibrowatt LLC

193.	34,315.10	Jerome J. Parks
194.	34,015.00	Mothers Against Drunk Driving
195.	34,000.00	Cigar Association of America, Inc.
196.	33,960.00	Coca-Cola Enterprises - Northeast
197.	33,804.97	Peninsula Regional Medical Center
198.	33,601.29	DBT Online, Inc.
199.	33,425.00	Legg Mason & Subsidiaries
200.	33,268.83	Anne Arundel County Association of Realtors, Inc.
201.	33,216.00	Melwood Horticultural Training Center, Inc.
202.	33,211.43	Prison Health Services, Inc.
203.	33,140.91	Alexander & Cleaver, P.A.
204.	33,087.89	Marylanders Against Handgun Abuse, Inc.
205.	33,000.00	National Paint & Coatings Association
206.	33,000.00	Maryland Credit Union League
207.	32,822.97	Culver Associates
208.	32,571.08	Choptank Electric Cooperative, Inc.
209.	32,563.00	America Online
210.	32,503.41	National Association of Industrial & Office Parks
211.	32,500.00	Maryland Burgler & Fire Alarm Association
212.	32,323.94	GEICO
213.	32,227.80	Delmarva Poultry Industry
214.	32,177.28	Maryland Bail Bond Association
215.	32,148.55	Frederick R. Harris, Inc.
216.	32,145.00	Maryland Cab Association
217.	32,044.76	Prince George's County Association of Realtors
218.	31,938.41	MAXIMUS
219.	31,895.33	American Academy of Pediatrics, Maryland Chapter
220.	31,836.62	Maryland Assisted Living Association (MALA)
221.	31,741.00	Baltimore Medical Systems, Inc.
222.	31,579.08	Washington Area Self Storage
223.	31,500.00	Maryland Troopers Association
224.	31,473.95	Columbia Gas of Maryland, Inc.
225.	31,187.17	Maryland State & DC Professional Firefighters Assn.
226.	31,040.00	Jones Communications
227.	31,000.00	Prince George's Chamber of Commerce
228.	30,832.34	MD/DC/DE Press Association
229.	30,797.47	Maryland Investigators & Security Association
230.	30,500.00	Amerigroup Corporation
231.	30,376.67	Mirant Mid-Atlantic LLC (formerly Southern Energy)
232.	30,176.03	Best Buddies International, Inc.

233.	30,040.00	American Lung Association
234.	30,000.00	Publishers Clearing House
235.	30,000.00	Parsons Corporation
236.	30,000.00	Bell Nursery, Inc.
237.	30,000.00	Baltimore Gas & Electric Company
238.	29,932.90	Multi-State Associates on behalf of NL Industries, Inc.
239.	29,921.00	Greater Washington Board of Trade
240.	29,912.77	Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers
241.	29,700.00	Maryland Coal Association
242.	29,652.50	Kennedy Kreiger Institute
243.	29,401.12	Motion Picture Association of America
244.	29,372.00	Anne Arundel Health System
245.	29,312.13	Center for Poverty Solutions
246.	29,100.00	Maryland Motor Coach Association, Inc.
247.	29,098.33	American Civil Liberties Union of Maryland
248.	29,000.92	Maryland Alliance for Fair Competition
249.	28,970.50	Comcast Cablevision of Maryland, L.P.
250.	28,632.50	Maryland Association of Certified Public Accountants
251.	28,610.55	Environmental Defense Fund
252.	28,355.57	Maryland Podiatric Medical Association
253.	28,301.81	Crown Central Petroleum Corporation
254.	28,190.46	Open Net Coalition
255.	28,185.00	Queen Anne's County Commissioners
256.	28,109.75	Health Insurance Association of America
257.	28,072.61	Planned Parenthood of Metropolitan Washington
258.	28,035.00	Alliance of American Insurers
259.	27,959.84	Teachers Insurance & Annuity Association
260.	27,905.95	American Physical Therapy Association of Maryland
261.	27,761.02	USAA
262.	27,571.00	Maryland Psychological Association
263.	27,500.00	Edison Parking Corporation
264.	27,500.00	CTB Government Relations, LLC
265.	27,486.78	Coalition for a Competitive Information & Technology Economy
266.	27,148.61	Fraternal Order of Police, Maryland State Lodge
267.	27,111.73	MD/DC/DE Soft Drink Association
268.	27,000.00	Prince George's County Public Schools
269.	27,000.00	Maryland Professional Driver Education Association
270.	27,000.00	Maryland Multi-Family Housing Association
271.	26,857.07	Planned Parenthood of Maryland
272.	26,718.07	National Association of Social Workers, MD Chapter

273.	26,597.76	Rouse Company
274.	26,481.98	Maryland Horse Breeders Association
275.	26,443.26	Essex-Middle River Community in Action Coalition
276.	26,420.73	Maryland Free State Cemetary Association
277.	26,410.26	State Law Enforcement Officers Labor Alliance
278.	26,350.00	Mid-Atlantic Car Wash Association, Inc.
279.	26,277.75	Maryland Science Center
280.	26,189.21	Mid-Atlantic Association of Community Health Centers
281.	26,065.86	Maryland Association of Green Industries
282.	26,000.00	60 Plus Association
283.	25,887.90	Public School Superintendents' Association of Maryland
284.	25,780.00	Mid-Atlantic Petroleum Distributors Association
285.	25,750.00	American Share Insurance Corporation
286.	25,398.00	Miller Brewing Company
287.	25,270.03	Pfizer, Inc.
288.	25,000.00	Starpower Communications
289.	25,000.00	Southport Financial, LLC and eOriginal
290.	25,000.00	Peachtree Settlement Funding
291.	25,000.00	Maryland Securities Industries
292.	25,000.00	Healthsouth



## APPENDIX B

### LOBBYISTS RECEIVING \$50,000 OR MORE IN COMPENSATION ONE OR MORE EMPLOYERS

*November 1, 1999 - October 31, 2000*

1 .	\$ 792,270.32	Alexander, Gary R.
2 .	659,508.00	Rifkin, Alan M.
3 .	640,007.93	Evans, Gerard E.
4 .	513,632.48	Rasmussen, Dennis
5 .	499,291.00	Enten, D. Robert
6 .	497,750.72	Bereano, Bruce C.
7 .	495,576.87	Stierhoff, John R.
8 .	476,113.71	Rozner, Joel D.
9 .	443,930.92	Schwartz, Joseph A., III
10 .	394,888.00	Pitcher, J. William
11 .	389,634.29	Johansen, Michael V.
12 .	316,156.25	Tiburzi, Paul A.
13 .	299,263.42	Doyle, James J., Jr.
14 .	295,384.00	McCoy, Dennis C.
15 .	292,497.50	Popham, Bryson
16 .	279,922.21	Cooke, Ira C.
17 .	274,733.30	Shaivitz, Robin F.
18 .	273,651.59	Adler, Maxine
19 .	259,451.00	Burridge, Carolyn T.
20 .	245,207.70	Doherty, Daniel T., Jr.
21 .	198,881.00	Levitan, Laurence
22 .	196,087.53	Goldstein, Franklin
23 .	175,050.00	Canning, Michael F.
24 .	169,791.73	O'Dell, Wayne
25 .	166,450.00	Lanier, Ivan
26 .	166,337.92	Rivkin, Deborah R.
27 .	164,300.00	Manis, Nicholas G.
28 .	162,809.98	Brocato, Barbara Marx
29	145,500.00	Arrington, Michael

30 .	144,075.00	White, Peter B.
31 .	139,756.35	Kasemeyer Pamela Metz
32 .	138,479.16	Winstead, David
33 .	135,700.00	Stebbins, Dana B.
34 .	135,259.95	Freedman, Chantel
35 .	134,576.00	Burns, Kimberly M.
36 .	132,882.62	Neil, John B.
37 .	125,000.00	Carter, W. Minor
38 .	123,568.03	Miedusiewski, American Joe
39 .	115,430.29	Collins, Carville B.
40 .	114,500.00	Gisriel, Michael U.
41 .	108,149.00	Winchester, Albert, III
42 .	107,078.92	McDonough, John P.
43 .	104,128.00	Pica, John A., Jr.
44 .	95,000.00	Baker, Ross L.
45 .	91,500.00	Proctor, Gregory
46 .	91,416.00	Genn, Gilbert
47 .	90,000.00	Behney, Elizabeth Buck
48 .	88,896.00	Goeden, James P.
49 .	86,691.00	Johnson, Deron A.
50 .	84,448.84	Buckingham, Stephen C.
51 .	83,561.27	Funk, David
52 .	74,680.00	Latham, Robert E.
53 .	74,400.00	Neily, Alice J.
54 .	71,000.00	Boston, Frank
55 .	70,135.47	Doolan, Devin John
56 .	70,000.00	Hill, Denise
57 .	70,000.00	Carpenter, Jonathan
58 .	69,500.00	Robbins, Earl H., Jr.
59 .	69,450.00	Valentino-Benitez, Ellen
60 .	66,165.75	Shaw, Carolyn R.
61 .	62,500.00	Manis, George N.
62 .	62,398.67	Sheehan, Lorraine M.
63 .	62,047.04	Gunther, Robert
64 .	60,000.00	Gally, Eric
65 .	59,950.00	Binderman, Mindy Koplan
66 .	59,750.00	Sammis, Elizabeth

67 .	59,567.00	Wayson, Edward O., Jr.
68 .	59,492.00	Hoover, Lesa N.
69 .	59,359.33	Marks, Isaac
70 .	58,000.00	Costello, Christopher B.
71 .	57,120.00	Silver, Edgar P.
72 .	56,150.00	McHugh, Kathleen
73 .	56,120.00	Doherty, Frances
74 .	55,998.00	Marshall, Patricia
75 .	55,902.00	Harting, Marta D.
76 .	55,855.00	Antoun, Mary
77 .	54,987.50	Stone, Thomas B., Jr.
78 .	53,375.98	Kimmel, Thomas Charles
79 .	52,590.00	Kronk, Annie K.
80 .	51,000.00	Townsend, Pegeen
81 .	50,000.00	Jepson, Robert



# APPENDIX C

## EXPENDITURES ON SPECIAL EVENTS November 1, 1999 - October 31, 2000

<u>Group Invited</u>	<u>Number of Times Invited</u>	<u>Total</u>
All General Assembly	100	\$497,611.85
Senate Only	1	819.23
House Only	1	39.92
Anne Arundel County Delegation	9	6,565.86
Baltimore City Delegation	10	11,358.73
Baltimore County Delegation	11	9,791.65
Carroll County Delegation	2	525.62
Harford County Delegation	3	1,302.74
Howard County Delegation	3	1,252.72
Lower Eastern Shore Delegation	8	1,908.98
Montgomery County Delegation	13	12,192.49
Prince George's County Delegation	17	28,618.15
Southern Maryland Delegation	1	362.25
Upper Eastern Shore Delegation	5	928.83
Western Maryland Delegation	10	4,477.59
Washington and Frederick Delegation	1	60.00
 <u>HOUSE</u>		
Appropriations	4	2,729.76
Commerce & Governmental Matters	9	16,208.30
Economic Matters	22	26,662.55
Environmental Matters	16	18,172.52
Judiciary	4	3,356.66
Ways and Means	8	12,226.22
 <u>SENATE</u>		
Budget and Taxation	8	3,964.31
Economic & Environmental Affairs	6	3,949.61
Finance	20	17,273.11
Judicial Proceedings	10	5,816.48

TOTAL: \$688,176.13

(NOTE: Where more than one committee was invited to the same event for the purposes of this report, there may be a proportionate allocation.)

# APPENDIX D

LOBBYING FIRMS EARNING \$1,000,000 OR MORE

November 1, 1999 - October 31, 2000

<u>Name of Firm</u>	<u>Amount of Compensation Reported</u>
Rifkin, Livingston, Levitan & Silver LLC	\$1,801,757.00
Alexander & Cleaver, P.A.	1,532,688.57
Evans & Stierhoff	1,135,584.80



